

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program – Trails Evaluation Criteria

The 2018-2022 Recreation and Conservation Plan and Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Unifying Strategy establishes priorities for funding outdoor recreation in Washington State. This evaluation instrument incorporates the plan's priorities identified specifically for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) to address underserved populations and health improvements.

Below are the changes to the evaluation instrument to reflect the 2018-2022 Unifying Strategy. These changes are incorporated into the evaluation criteria starting in the 2018 grant round.

- Add specific instructions on how to reply to criteria #1 "Need".
 - This change identifies the types of underserved populations and health indicators where the project is located.
- Remove criteria #10 "SCORP Priorities".
 - This question is replaced by the addition to criteria #1.

PROPOSED WWRP Trails Criteria Summary					
Score	#	Question	Project Type	Maximum Points Possible	Focus*
Advisory Committee	1	Need	All	15	Local
Advisory Committee	2	Linkages Between Trails	All	7.5	State, Local
Advisory Committee		Linkages Between Communities	All	7.5	State, Local
Advisory Committee	4	Immediacy of Threat	Acquisition	15	Local
			Combination	7.5	
Advisory Committee	5	Project Design	Development	15	Technical
			Combination	7.5	
Advisory Committee	6	Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship	All	10	State
Advisory Committee	7	Water Access or Views	All	3	State
Advisory Committee	8	Scenic Values	All	7	State
Advisory Committee	9	Enhancement of Wildlife Habitat	All	5	State
Advisory Committee	10	SCORP Priorities	All	5	State
Advisory Committee	11 <u>10</u>	Project Support	All	10	State, Local
Advisory Committee	12 <u>11</u>	Cost Efficiencies	All	5	State, Local
RCO Staff	13 <u>12</u>	Growth Management Act Preference	All	0	State
RCO Staff	14 <u>13</u>	Population Proximity	All	3	State
Total Points Possible: 93 <u>88</u>					

*Focus—Criteria orientation in accordance with the following priorities:

- State—those that meet general statewide needs (often called for in Revised Codes of Washington or the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan [SCORP])
- Local—those that meet local needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans)
- Technical—those that meet technical considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

Detailed Scoring Criteria: Trails

Advisory Committee Scored

1. **Need.**¹ Is the project needed and how will this project address the priorities for underserved populations and health recommendations in the 2018-2022 Recreation and Conservation Plan?

Consider the extent to which the project *fills an important trail need*. For example, consider:

Inventory

- Inventory of existing trails and support facilities
- Physical condition of the inventory

Use

- Amount of use of existing trails and support facilities
- Potential use of proposed trails and support facilities

Meeting the Need

- How the project meets the identified need
- Meets a current or future need
- Unserved or under-served populations

*Vision*²

- Is the project named by location or type as a priority in an adopted local, regional, or statewide recreational or resource plan? If yes, describe how *this* project plays a *significant* role in meeting the priorities of the plan.
- Does the project assist in implementation of a local shoreline master program, updated according to Revised Code of Washington 90.58.080 or local comprehensive plans updated according to Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.130? If yes, please describe.
- Consistency with a clearly articulated vision of a trail network or system.

¹Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a)(v-vi)

²Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a) (v)

To assist you in answering the questions about underserved populations and health recommendations, locate your project on the Grant Applicant Data Tool to determine whether your project is in a census tract in which one or more of the populations listed below are present.

Demographic Measures for Underserved Populations

- The median household income level in the census tract where the project is located is below the median statewide household income level (\$62,108 as of 2015)
- Based on percentage, there are more people of color in the census tract where the project is located than the statewide percentage (30 percent as of 2015)
- Based on percentage, there are more people with a disability in the census tract where the project is located than the statewide percentage (13 percent as of 2015)

Opportunities for Health Improvements

- The body mass index for ages 16-19 in the census tract where the project is located is higher than the statewide body mass index (22.94 as of 2015)
- The mortality rate in the census tract where the project is located is higher than the statewide mortality rate (692 as of 2015)

▲ Point Range: 0–5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 3.

~~2.~~ Revised April 2006 Revised October 2017.

3.2. Linkage Between Trails.³ Does the trail project connect existing trails?

- Describe to what extent the proposed trail or trailhead links and serves existing trails and trail networks, or will provide potential linkages?
- Does a coordinated plan identify the proposed linkages?
- Does the project enhance a statewide, regional, or community trails network?

▲ Point Range: 0–7.5.

Revised February 2016

4.3. Linkage Between Communities.⁴ Does the trail project connect communities?

Applicant should show how the project will create linkages between communities.

³Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a) (iv)

⁴Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a)(iii)

Broadly interpret the term “Community” to include, but not be limited to, the following linkages:

- Neighborhoods, subdivisions, business districts
- Urban and rural areas
- Destinations, such as parks, landscapes, scenic overlooks, schools, churches, libraries, cultural sites, or trail systems
- Disparate groups of people

▲ Point Range: 0-7.5.

Revised February 2016

5.4. Immediacy of Threat.⁵ Does a threat to the public availability of a part of the trail exist? (acquisition and combination projects only)

Consider the availability of alternatives. A project threatened with the loss of a critical link will merit more evaluation points than a proposal where other routes exist.

▲ Point Range below. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 3 for development projects and 1.5 for combination projects.

0 points	No evidence presented.
1-2 points	Minimal threat; trail opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use in the next 36 months.
3 points	Actions are under consideration that could result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for public use.
4-5 points	Actions will be taken that will result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use.
	or
	A threat situation has occurred or is imminent that has led an organization to acquire rights in the land at the request of the applicant agency.

Revised May 7, 2003

⁵Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a)(ii)

6-5. Project Design. Is the proposal appropriately designed for the intended use(s)?
(development and combination projects only)⁶

Considerations include, but are not limited to:

- Design consistent with need, and need of intended users.
- Adequate surfacing, width, spatial relationships.
- Design reduces user conflicts
- Appropriate setting
- Road and trail crossings well planned
- Signs and parking provided at trailhead locations
- Loops and destination of trails
- Ease and cost of maintenance
- Realistic cost estimates provided
- Based on the most current applicable Americans with Disabilities Act or Architectural Barriers Act standard, guidance, or best practice, the design is accessible to the greatest extent possible, given the context and purpose of the trail.
- If trail is adjacent to a roadway, is there adequate separation from the roadway to ensure a quality recreation experience?
- Renovation returns the site/facility to its original use and capacity, or expands its capacity and useful life (the need for renovation should not be due to lack of adequate maintenance).

▲ Point Range below. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 3 for development projects and 1.5 for combination projects.

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 0 points | No evidence presented. |
| 1-2 points | Design does not adequately address the above considerations. |
| 3 points | Design adequately addresses the above considerations. |
| 4-5 points | Design addresses the considerations in an outstanding manner. |

⁶Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a)(v)

7.6. Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship. Will the project result in a quality, sustainable, recreational opportunity while protecting the integrity of the environment?

Factors to consider for acquisition and/or development and renovation projects are outlined in the table below.

Acquisition	Development and Renovation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the acquisition and proposed development preserve the natural function of the site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposed development protect natural resources onsite and integrate sustainable elements such as low impact development techniques, green infrastructure, or environmentally preferred building products?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do the proposed uses protect, enhance, or restore the ecosystem functions of the property? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation and Surfaces – Are you replacing invasive plant species with native vegetation? Are you using pervious surfaces for any of the proposed facilities?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there invasive species on site? If there are, what is your response plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education – Are you installing interpretive panels or signs that educate users about sustainability?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the strategy or plan for maintenance and stewardship of the site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials – What sustainable materials are included in the project?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do the natural characteristics of the site support future planned uses? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Energy – What energy efficient features are you adding?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide for greater fuel economy, is the proposed acquisition located close to the intended users? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What modes of transportation provide access to the site?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What modes of transportation provide access to the site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water – Is the on-site storm water managed by rain gardens, porous paving, or other sustainable features? Does the design exceed permit requirements for storm water management?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this project protect wetlands or wetland functions? Describe the size, quality, and classification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If there are wetlands on site, describe the size, quality, and classification and explain how the design considers the wetland functions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the proposed acquisition help create connectivity? How many acres are already protected? How critical is this property to the overall plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the strategy or plan for long-term maintenance and stewardship of the site?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other noteworthy characteristics demonstrate how the natural features of the site contribute to energy efficiency, 	

Acquisition	Development and Renovation
less maintenance, fewer environmental impacts, or sustainability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other developed features will contribute to increasing energy efficiencies, reducing maintenance, minimizing environmental impacts, or being more sustainable?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2.

Adopted January 2014.

8.7. _____ Water Access or Views.⁷ Does the project provide direct access to water (physical access by person or boat) or views?

Considerations include, but are not limited to:

- How long does it take to reach the water access?
- What quality is the access (for example, are there obstructions – vegetation, mud, inclines, etc.)?
- What percentage of visitors likely will use the access?
- Does the project provide views?
- How long does it take to reach the view area?

▲ Point Range: 0-3.

Revised February 2016

9.8. _____ Scenic Values.⁸ Does the project provide scenic values?

Considerations include, but are not limited to:

- How long does it take to reach an area of scenic value?
- What percentage of visitors likely will access these?
- Are there scenic values of high quantity and quality?

⁷Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a)(vii) and 79A.15.070(6)(a)(ix)

⁸Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a)(ix)

- How does distance and perspective affect the scenic value?
- How much scenic variety is provided?

▲ Point Range. 0-7 points.

Revised February 2016

10.9. Enhancement of Wildlife Habitat.⁹ How will this proposal enhance wildlife habitat beyond what may be required by a development or land use authority such as statute, ordinance, permit, rule and regulation, mitigation requirement, etc.?

- What are the potential outcomes of your efforts? Why and how will they benefit wildlife?

▲ Point Range 0-5 points.

Revised February 2016

~~**11. SCORP Priorities.** How will this project address statewide or regional priorities as described in the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan?~~

~~▲ Point Range: 0-5.~~

~~Adopted February 2016~~

12.10. Project Support. The extent that the public (statewide, community, or user groups) has been provided with an adequate opportunity to become informed, and/or support for the project seems apparent.¹⁰

Broadly interpret the term *project support* to include, but not be limited to:

- Extent of efforts by the applicant to identify and contact all parties, i.e. an outreach program to local, regional, and statewide entities.
- The extent that there is project support, including:
 - Voter-approved initiatives, bond issues, referenda
 - Ordinance and resolution adoption
 - Public meeting attendance
 - Endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user and friends groups

⁹Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a)(viii)

¹⁰Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(a)(i)

- o Media coverage
- The extent to which the public was involved in a comprehensive planning process that includes this project.

▲ Point Range. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2.

0 points	No evidence presented.
1-2 points	Marginal community support. Opportunities for only minimal public involvement (i.e. a single adoption hearing) and/or little evidence that the public supports the project.
3 points	Adequate support.
4-5 points	The public has received ample and varied opportunity to provide meaningful input into the project, and there is overwhelming support; and/or the public was so supportive from the project's inception that an extensive public participation process was not necessary.

Revised May 7, 2003

13.11. Cost Efficiencies. To what extent does this project demonstrate efficiencies or a reduction in government costs through documented use of donations or other resources?

Donations – cash, real property, volunteer labor, equipment use, or materials

- What are the donations for this project?
- Who is making the donations?
- What are the values of the donations and how were the values determined?
- Are the donations in hand?
- If the donations are not in hand, do you have a letter of commitment from the donors that specifies what is being donated and when?
- Are the donations necessary for implementation of the project? Are donations included in the project proposal?

Private grants awarded by non-governmental organizations

- Is there a private grant that is being used as match for this project?
- Who awarded the grant?

- What is the grant amount?
- What is the purpose of the grant?
- When will grant funds be available?

Are there other efficiencies for this project that will result in cost savings?

- What is the cost efficiency?
- Who is providing it?
- What's the value?
- When was the commitment made and when does it expire?

▲ Point Range: 0-5.

Revised February 2016.

Scored by RCO Staff—Applicants Do Not Answer in Evaluation Session

14.12. Growth Management Act Preference. Has the applicant made progress toward meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act?¹¹

Has the applicant made progress toward meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA)?¹²

State law requires that:

- Whenever a state agency is considering awarding grants to finance public facilities, it shall consider whether the applicant¹³ has adopted a comprehensive plan and development regulations as required by Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.040.
- When reviewing such requests, the state agency shall accord additional preference to applicants that have adopted the comprehensive plan and development regulations. An applicant is deemed to have satisfied the requirements for adopting a comprehensive plan and development regulations if it:

¹¹Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250 (Growth Management Act-preference required.)

¹²Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250 (Growth Management Act-preference required)

¹³County, city, or town applicants only. This segment of the question does not apply to state agency or tribal government applicants.

- o Adopts or has adopted within the time periods specified in state law;
 - o Adopts or has adopted by the time it requests a grant or loan; or
 - o Demonstrates substantial progress toward adopting within the time periods specified in state law. An agency that is more than 6 months out of compliance with the time periods has not demonstrated substantial progress.
- C. A request from an applicant planning under state law shall be accorded no additional preference based on subsection (B) over a request from an applicant not planning under this state law.

RCO staff score this question using information from the state Department of Commerce, Growth Management Division. Scoring occurs after RCO's technical completion deadline. If an agency's comprehensive plan, development regulation, or amendment has been appealed to the Growth Management Hearings Board, the agency cannot be penalized during the period of appeal.

▲ Point Range below. RCO staff subtracts a maximum of 1 point; there is no multiplier.

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| Minus 1 point | The applicant does not meet the requirements of Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250. |
| 0 points | The applicant meets the requirements of Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250. |
| 0 points | The applicant is a nonprofit organization or state or federal agency. |

Revised January 2014

15-13. Population Proximity. Is the project in a populated area?¹⁴

This question is scored by RCO staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive a score, the map must show the project location and project boundary in relationship to a city's or town's urban growth boundary.

▲ Point Range below. The result from "A" is added to the result from "B." Projects in cities with a population of more than 5,000 *and* within high density counties receive points from both "A" and "B." RCO staff awards a maximum of 3.

- A. The project is within the urban growth boundary of a city or town with a population of 5,000 or more.

¹⁴Revised Code of Washington 79A.25.250

Yes 1.5 points

No 0 points

AND

B. The project is within a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile.

Yes 1.5 points

No 0 points

Revised November 2007